



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/220,462	12/23/98	TONNA	C 4167-05

RANDY G. HENLEY  
OTIS ELEVATOR COMPANY  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
TEN FARM SPRINGS  
FARMINGTON, CT 06032

PM82/0327

EXAMINER

MCALLISTER, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 03/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/220,462

Applicant(s)  
Tonna et al

Examiner  
Steven B. McAllister

Group Art Unit  
2167



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 28, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 7-38 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 7-15 and 22-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2167

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa (JP 402081888) in view of Aulanko et al (5,665,944).

Yoshikawa discloses a car, at least one elevator door on the front face (see English abstract), first and second sheaves 12 disposed to the first and second sides of the door opening, a rope 13 forming a closed loop around the sheaves wherein the door is attached to the rope (see Fig. 1) and a drive motor 9a on the front portion of the car coupled to the elevator door.

Yoshikawa does not show that the motor is flat or integrated into one of the sheaves. Aulanko et al shows a flat motor integrated into a sheave (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the drive apparatus of Yoshikawa by adding a flat motor integrated into one of the sheaves as shown in Aulanko et al in order to save space and to simplify the drive system.

Art Unit: 2167

As to claim 17, since the sheaves 12 are mounted on the front face of the elevator car, and since the flat motor is integrated into the sheave, Yoshikawa in view of Aulanko et al inherently disclose that the flat motor is mounted on the front face of the elevator car.

3. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Aulanko et al as applied to claim s 16 and 17 above, and further in view of Tracey (5,701,973).

Yoshikawa shows all elements of the claims including a header bracket 2 mounted on the front face of the elevator car. Yoshikawa in view of Aulanko et al do not specifically show that the header is mounted between the lower edge and upper edge of the car. Tracey shows a header bracket 32 mounted between the upper and lower edges, above the door opening, of the car (see Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the apparatus of Yoshikawa by mounting the header between the upper and lower edges of the elevator car in order to provide a solid structural mounting for the header and to minimize the profile of the elevator car.

As to claim 21, Yoshikawa shows upper and lower portions of the rope connected to the doors (see Fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2167

*Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. McAllister whose telephone number is (703) 308-7052.

  
Steven B. McAllister

March 26, 2001

 3/26/01  
ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600 2100